IDAPA 37.03.09
Negotiated Rule Making
January 26, 2007

Negotiated Rule Making commenced on Thursday, January 26, 2007 at 8:30 AM MST. This meeting was conducted using the University of Idaho's teleconferencing system, and stakeholders participated from locations in Twin Falls, Idaho Falls, and Boise. Since North Idaho participants were in Boise, no video hook up was arranged for Coeur d'Alene. The complete meeting was recorded and is summarized below.

Discussion concerning IGWA letter and IDWR Response

Mr. Tony Hackett, President, Idaho Groundwater Association (IGWA), opened the meeting

- IGWA did not want the proposed revisions jammed through the process. Lots of topics had been passed up, and the January deadline raised serious concerns.
- The letter from IGWA was not intended to humiliate or incriminate IDWR. IGWA will work with IDWR if IDWR will work with drillers.
- He is impressed with the effort and tone of IDWR since the letter was delivered last week, more than in the 1st nine months of the negotiations. The recent attitude was not comparable at all to the attitude last week
- The letter was not a dagger, but meant to get IDWR's attention.
- Mr. Hackett apologized for not meeting with IDWR Friday, Monday, or Tuesday Everyone is busy, and negotiations are happening too fast Because of rushing, things get dropped.

Mr. Dave Tuthill, Acting Director, IDWR, accepted the apology in the spirit of working together.

Mr. Hackett replied that IDWR is hung up on liners and casing. Regardless of recommendations in the drilling manual, the rules should recognize regional and geographic requirements and sound practices.

Mr. Tuthill responded that IDWR is open to the regional concept of rules designed for different geology or regions.

Mr. Hart summarized by touching base to ensure everyone is committed to the process of negotiations and that IDWR may need to extend the effort for a successful outcome.

Mr. Chuck Galloway stated:

- Early efforts were designed to collect input from drillers, regulators, and manufacturers.
- IDWR commenced drafting its version of the rules in November.
- A meeting is scheduled for March 2 to look at a near final draft of the revision.
- IDWR will hold weekly open lines of communication. A block of time will be set aside for discussions between IDWR (Tom Neace and John Sharkey) and drillers to entertain ideas and concerns.
- Many issues were not resolved to IDWR's comfort level and a meeting after March 2 may be required.
- IDWR wants stakeholder input and buy in, but will not wait for full consensus.

Mr. Hackett replied that IGWA would work toward consensus but it feared IDWR would close its doors and re-write rules previously discussed in public.

Chuck Galloway responded

- Regardless of disagreements with IGWA, it is IDWR's mission to protect the resource
- While some drillers may be unhappy, IDWR is attempting to accommodate the different geology around the state
- From the initial start of negotiations to revise the rules, IDWR never stated that full agreement would be reached IDWR's mission is to protect the resources
- Changes will not be made behind closed doors, but IDWR will explain any changes made

John Sharkey, IDWR, stated:

- There might be substantive changes made by the Water Board or the Legislature
- IDWR would keep the drillers apprised of major changes

Tom Neace, IDWR, stated there will still be a standard public comment period and a public hearing for the proposed rule even after the draft is prepared allowing additional opportunities for changes

Mr Galloway stated that IDWR has laid out a schedule to get the revisions to the Idaho Legislature in 2008 This schedule is posted on the web site

Jeff Fereday, Givens Pursley, asked if the letter from IGWA would be posted as part of the record

Mr Galloway stated that the IGWA letter would be posted

Rule Discussion – Casing and Liner Discussion

John Sharkey opened discussion concerning definitions The definition of artesian had been changed to comply with the statute There may be changes to the term waste, consolidated, and unconfined Formation is back in the definitions If not needed it may be deleted The term liner had changed and will continue to be at play as thermoplastic liner and casing revisions occur

Tony Hackett stated that applications of thermoplastic pipe are based on regional geology differences and may call for regional specifications rather than a single statewide standard

John Sharkey stated IDWR needs regional input of geography and geology When IDWR asks for assistance, IDWR is sincerely looking for input and recommended text and changes While comments in the committee are helpful, written suggestions with greater specificity are what IDWR staff find most beneficial

Chuck Galloway commended Nathan Erickson from Twin Falls for soliciting input via email from drillers in the Southern Region

There was a general discussion about the value of the DVDs to review what was said in meetings Tony Hackett stated that the videotape was a good backup Gary Duspiva stated that the DVDs are valuable, but take time to review Chuck Galloway said we were at the mercy of University of Idaho, and that two of the recordings were lost due to University of Idaho errors It was disappointing, because good things happened at those meetings Mike Hart added that video recordings aren't always available in a timely fashion Rob Whitney, IDWR, stated that reviewing the DVDs was very time consuming and he asked for comments in writing from stakeholders Chuck Galloway stated that he marked time in hours and minutes on the DVD to located issues and topics Gary Dispiva agreed that there was valuable information on the DVDs and was disappointed at their loss Mike Hart, Facilitator, stated that even though meeting recordings have occasionally failed, the video conference saves travel time and was a positive experience for state-wide participation DVD recordings are an added benefit for the record and allow post meeting review (when available), but technology isn't always bullet proof

Rob Whitney stated that IDWR was trying to get through this process, but it was discouraging that most comments are criticism of what is wrong with little acknowledgement of where the rule

revisions have been appropriate and acceptable He appealed to committee to tell IDWR what is right. IDWR staff need to know where the revisions are working as well as where they still need work.

John Sharkey commenced a long discussion regarding casing and liners.

- The definition of casing was unchanged, but liner was changed at line 222
- Rule 40 had been modified. Now only thermoplastic as casing had to be packed with filter sand in incompetent or alternating incompetent units.
- IDWR plans to have meetings across the state with various drillers to discuss changes in Rule 40. Most changes to date were based on stakeholder input.

Brent McCarty, Rathdrum, Idaho, stated that 4-in. thermoplastic pipe in a 6-in. hole is not a threat to groundwater resources. The problem arose from the word "non weathered" in the definitions He drilled weathered rock that usually stood open and was acceptable.

John Sharkey, IDWR, stated that Nathan Erickson, IDWR Twin Falls, had submitted recommendations that would be incorporated into the next draft. IDWR was looking for thermoplastic pipe as liners, but it needed consistency and comprehensiveness to avoid misuse of thermoplastic pipe.

Dale Pippitt, Twin Falls, stated that he was frustrated. Thirty-five (35) definitions had been changed since the last version of the rules, all without discussion from stakeholders. For example, Line 151 added the term "not fractured," but the entire Snake River Basin is fractured basalt. This simple word change is important. Willy-nilly change is not right. New definitions were added without discussion. He asked if we needed to discuss all of the 35 new definitions.

Rob Whitney, IDWR, stated that definitions were interrelated with other topics. As topics changed the definitions evolved.

Ed Squires, Hydro Logic, Inc, Boise, stated that he agreed with Dale Pippitt. All geologic units have fractures, so the definition is problematic

Jeff Fereday suggested using stable or unstable and dropping competent and incompetent due to the potential for confusion when using the words in a sentence containing the word "in." Stable and unstable would be more clear

Gary Duspiva stated that clays are unconsolidated, but he encounters clays that won't cave.

Lee Baron, Fairfield, Idaho, stated that the well driller should be able to use his discretion on this matter.

John Sharkey stated that the terms competent and incompetent were critical in the installation of seals.

Lee Baron stated again that the objective is to keep the hole open, and the driller should be required to use his judgment

After some extensive discussion regarding the definition of competent and incompetent, Mr. Roger Buchanan, Andrew Well Drilling, Idaho Falls, stated that the committee should discuss seals, as seals would affect other definitions.

Rule Discussion – Seals

John Sharkey introduced seals and revisions to the seal requirements.

- Whereas at the last meeting IDWR had not examined the straw man, this draft of the revisions included ideas and concepts of the straw man.
- The current rule is not bad or unclear.

- IDWR desires a seal in every well, but wanted flexibility.

John Sharkey stated that Rule 50, Line 521 is based on Idaho Code's language on artesian well. After reviewing lines 547, 556, 567, 588, John Sharkey pointed out the table of minimum sealing requirements and revisions will be made.

Various committee members drew diagrams of various types of wells to discuss sealing under water table and artesian conditions.

Rob Whitney drew a well diagram of a well penetrating an artesian aquifer. Idaho Code requires sealing of artesian wells. The well must not penetrate confining layer above the aquifer. The existing rule implies a full depth seal. Many drillers drive the pipe into the clay (a "drive shoe seal") and many think that type of seal is acceptable. However, Idaho Code prohibits mixture of waters have different temperatures, pressure, or water chemistry.

Lee Baron stated that if the Code was enforced, drilling in the Fairfield area would be prohibited.

Gary Duspiva stated that Treasure Valley is 99% artesian. Drive and drive (cable too) or air rotary cannot be used, even though he believes that the clays naturally seal the wells. The Marsing area has layer of sand that produce 1-5 gpm and each as a different character.

Mike Hart asked if such mixing is in violation of the current rule and statute.

Rob Whitney stated that IDWR was attempting to define aquifers to recognized different layers of water.

John Sharkey stated:

- IDWR needed to draft some language about sufficient thickness of the confining layer
- IDWR was not requiring a full depth seal, so integrity of the casing is critical. Casing corrodes and allows water to cross-connect aquifers.

Brett McCarty said that he had never seen casing set into clay.

John Sharkey referred to Line 536 that required setting the casing into bedrock.

Tony Hackett stated that he normally set the casing into the clay and then installed a screen into the underlying sand or gravel aquifer.

John Sharkey suggested IDWR might draft a sub rule to address bedrock and sand situations.

Lee Baron, Fairfield, stated that the material in the annulus outside the casing has a zero transmissivity behind the shoe.

Ed Squires disagreed:

- Basically, in drill and drive wells (90% of wells installed today), there are serious exchanges between aquifers.
- Movement of small concentrations of As, U, F can cause major problems for resource protection.
- In the drill and drive situation, the shoe is oversize. The shoe will tend to collapse sand and clay which will fall behind shoe.
- In a one or two-aquifer situation, different heads and water chemistries, an 18-ft surface seal doesn't do much good. We need to seal down to the first confining layer to seal off contaminants in the surface zone
- In multi-layer aquifers, using drill and drive, the shoe creates spaces behind the casing. Clays are generally mudstones, and these do not seal behind the shoe. The voids allow movement of water and contaminants between aquifers.
- Ed Squires presented diagrams of well completion in multiple aquifer systems

Mike Hart suggested that the rules may need to distinguish between one aquifer with three layers and a three-aquifer system even when the reality in the field may be difficult to determine.

Ed Squires concluded that, based on wells across the state, it would be possible to determine if there are multiple aquifers.

Brett McCarty stated that the idea of regional well standards would allow IDWR to concepts of construction for multiple aquifers across the state. For example, the rules should state that, if a type of geology is encountered, then wells should be built according to certain standards.

John Sharkey reminded the committee that, at the previous meeting, the committee did not believe that there was enough time to develop regional rules. Most members said no.

Jody Denning, Denning Drilling, Rigby, Idaho, stated:

- There was no way to install seals as suggested if the driller was using a cable tool drill rig.
- There were a lot of issues that would frustrate drillers
- IDWR should bring science to prove what we need to do.
- If areas of drilling concern or areas of geologic concern were to be implemented, IDWR should identify where there are problems that the current standards do not meet.

Kelly Bond, Teton Water Works, Shelley, Idaho, concurred.

John Sharkey, IDWR, stated:

- IDWR understands the issue of cost of drilling. The goal is to ensure that there is no more than a 15% increase in costs.
- IDWR believes that seals at depth are critical to protect the resource. 50 years ago, everyone in the Treasure Valley believed that the current sealing procedure was adequate. Now, it is clear that current standards for seals are not adequate, and IDWR wants to avoid this outcome in other parts of the state.

Fred Walker, Walker Water Works, Twin Falls, stated that low-pressure artesian wells should require less seal thickness and depth, compared to high pressure wells. The sealing plan outlined by Ed Squires does, in fact, commingle aquifers and waters of different head and quality.

John Sharkey, IDWR stated that IDWR staff and many drillers had worked into how to seal artesian aquifers. "*The driller shall ensure adequacy*" of seal dependent upon the pressure. The well owner has the responsibility to fix compromised seal or casing.

Chuck Galloway stated that the well owner has the obligation to fix any compromised seal or casing. The Well Driller informs the owner and IDWR. Repair or abandon are two options for the well owner.

Dale Pippitt concurred that IDWR was on the right track to separate artesian from other wells. There are other considerations. For example, public wells that are over pumped may move contaminants across aquifers.

Ed Squires stated:

- Whereas cost is an issue, he remembers similar discussions 10 years ago about casing thickness. Then, cost of casing was the determining factor.
- Now, however, casing costs have risen dramatically, but there is no slow down in drilling.
- If the standards were higher, better materials and better seals would be required, and drillers would not be forced to drill fast to make money. Less wear and tear on the equipment.
- People will pay for better wells.

- Steel quality is a big issue. Wells with 3/8-in. wall thickness last longer than wells with ¼-in. wall thickness.

Brett McCarty agreed that the poor quality of steel is a big problem.
The United Water of Idaho representative stated that one large municipal well with a full depth seal has less impact than 20 poorly sealed individual wells.

Dale Pippitt stated that most casing failures were due to electrolysis between the casing (a ground rod) and other electrical fields. High velocities in the casing created static charge.

Gary Duspiva stated that in the Simplot Dixie area, double cased wells were installed to seal out the upper aquifer.

John Sharkey moved the discussion to sealing wells in Unconsolidated aquifers without confining clays.

- Ed Hagen, IDEQ, stated that wells should be sealed to lower producing zone.
- John Sharkey stated that there was no definition of the thickness of the confining layer. Unperforated casing had to be installed 5 ft into the water.
- Brett McCarty pointed out that the water table fluctuations increased from 40 ft to 60 ft in the Coeur d'Alene area. He asked if 5 ft was enough. He believed that IDWR should outline standard to ensure all drillers built wells to protect the consumer.
- Chuck Galloway stated that IDWR was walking a fine line between consumer protection and groundwater protection.
- John Sharkey stated that 5 ft was a minimum and did not preclude deeper installations.
- Gary Duspiva observed he needed waivers from IDWR because the water level was 4 ft below surface. He did not perforate the bottom 10 ft, but still needed a waiver.
- Ed Squires presented an example near Prism, ID, where layers of soil confine the groundwater.
- John Sharkey observed, again, that the proposed rule did not define confining layers. It was up to the driller.

Tony Hackett observed that the use of thermoplastic pipe in unconsolidated clay was still unresolved.

Ed Squires stated that the only difference between thermoplastic liner and casing was the Standard Dimension Ratio (SDR), which would be a cost difference

Ed Hagan observed that fine-grained material may not be confining layers but perching layers.

John Sharkey observed that the definitions in the rule were designed for legal purpose, not to be a geological dictionary.

Ed Hagan replied that the definitions should have consistency with geological definitions, but layers above the water level cannot confine anything.

Ed. Squires concurred.

Gary Duspiva suggested applying the term low permeability layer.

Brett McCarty stated that he was glad to see this revised sealing language. It works and is a good approach.

Roger Buchanan concurred with Brett McCarty.

John Sharkey opened the discussion on Sealing of Wells with Confining Layers.

- John Sharkey drew a well diagram of a multiple layers system with at least one confining layer.

- John Sharkey stated that Lines 556 through 570 would apply. Seal must be installed through upper most confining layer.
- At least three seals would be required, the 18-ft surface seal, the upper most confining layer, and the seal into the layer above the producing zone.
- IDWR was not specifying a drilling method. It was the obligation of the Well Driller to determine if multiple casing strings would be required.
- The Well Driller may perforate casing and pressure grout to install the intermediate sealing.

Brett McCarty asked how IDWR intended to enforce these procedures

Ed Squires suggested that IDWR consider using the depth of the well to discriminate between types of drilling. Most wells are shallow domestic wells, but if IDWR would require mud rotary for deeper wells, seals could be installed full length.

Mr. Hagan, IDEQ, concurred and suggested using IDEQ's nitrate priority areas, U and As areas to identify areas that might require unique drilling methods

Ed Squires elaborated that shallow domestic wells could continue with air rotary and drill and drive. But, deeper wells should be installed with mud rotary. Would not affect most drillers, as most wells less than 200 ft deep could be drilled air rotary

Brett McCarty asked IDWR to describe scenario to use the new rule in low permeability zone or the adequacy of the seal.

Rob Whitney replied that full depth seals would be the most easy to regulate.

Tony Hackett asked what were the problems with mud rotary.

Ed Squires replied that there were lots of options with mud rotary, and air rigs could be retrofitted for mud.

Brett McCarty stated mud could hydrolyze and erode zones. It is possible to assure the drill and drive method could provide a positive seal method.

Ed Squires replied that mud was never used as the seal. Rather, grout was added outside of casing. It was not necessary to pump grout to the surface, because some seal is better than none.

The Committee adjourned for lunch.

After lunch, discussion on sealing of wells in unconsolidated sediments with multiple aquifers continued

Dale Pippitt stated that there was no definition for low permeability materials, typically 0.0000001 to 0.0000000001 cm/sec. He asked how IDWR would enforce this definition. Rather, he suggested sealing to confining layers, not low permeability material. It was simply unenforceable

John Sharkey replied that IDWR considered this question, i.e. low permeability material, and requested input and ideas from drillers.

Brett McCarty questioned the basis for sealing based on well logs on file.

John Sharkey replied that IDWR has hundreds of thousands of well logs and it was safe to say that IDWR's Regional Representatives know the geology and what's going on in each region of the State

Brett McCarty retorted that IDWR should reconsider the areas of geologic concern. IDWR could protect both consumers and the resource if IDWR identified areas for specific construction. It would not be hard.

John Sharkey replied that to add additional areas of drilling concern, some proof would be required.

Brett McCarty suggested that the Regional Representatives could use the Start Card

John Sharkey said that IDWR could map areas of geologic conditions or use the nitrate priority areas. But, IDWR will have to identify contiguous areas. A well may fall on or near the boundary. Some areas are indistinct, and wells could straddle any boundary.

Brett McCarty suggested that IDWR outline seal method based on geology encountered by Driller. He was adamant that the rule should not allow IDWR to second guess the well driller.

John Sharkey posed questions for the committee:

- Is the Committee advocating this approach in these rules? Within this timeframe?
- How would that approach be different from the approach outline in today's draft revision to the rules?

Brett McCarty responded that new rules should not be more complex than existing rules. The draft today was more complex and complicated. Rather, IDWR should try to add areas of geologic concern.

Rob Whitney, IDWR, asked how a proposal based on the start card would be different from the rule revision proposed today? The proposed language is based on varying geology. Areas of drilling concern are a major step and affects the public.

Brett McCarty stated that a well driller, after receiving a call from a consumer, should deal with black and white rules, not 2nd guessing on how to construct the well. He wanted a level playing field between drillers. Otherwise, IDWR will spend time chasing mistakes. He would like to see more black and white rules.

Lee Baron, Fairfield, stated that he could not find the permeability of sand, as it is measured in millions of inches per day. Filling the annulus with cuttings is better than bentonite. Any material in the annulus is a seal, regardless of material. He pointed out the clay held more water than sand

Sharkey and Whitney disagreed. They replied that porosity is different from permeability, and contaminants are found now below confining layers because wells are not sealed. Bentonite is the industry standard and should be used.

Lee Barron argued that chips bridge, bentonite will not descend through standing water, and slurry cracks after dehydration.

Gary Duspiva stated that he was leery of sealing wells on the basis of logs. Logs are valuable but should not be used to seal wells.

Chuck Galloway, IDWR, stated that he was intrigued by the idea of areas of geological conditions. The only way to achieve that method would be to start with areas of drilling concern. But, that topic is off limits.

Brett McCarty stated that areas of geologic concern should have proposed language for seal, but handled as guidance.

Tom Neace, IDWR, added that not every condition could be covered in the rules.

Roger Buchanan, Andrew Well Drilling, Idaho Falls, pointed to the standards for Island Park. IDWR, about 7-8 years ago, established drilling standards without establishing an area of drilling concern. There could be a similar effort in the Treasure Valley. In Island Park, IDWR and drillers implemented higher standards and it worked. Extra seal, deeper casing, and disinfection. Now, almost everyone follows the new standard.

Jody Denning added that the criteria for drilling are on the permit.

Rob Whitney asked if well drillers wanted more regulations in the permit to, essentially, help them design the well. In Treasure Valley, a standard of 10-in. surface casing was established to use granular bentonite over the water table. Completed wells use 8-in. casing and neat cement to seal the well. If the driller can place it to depth, it would be OK.

Gary Duspiva stated that he could seal to the first clay layer, but could not seal deeper.

Chuck Galloway pointed to lines 361 and 362 that IDWR could add more standards.

Brett McCarty pointed out the pitfalls in line 556. There are confining layers and IDWR has the tools to outline areas of drilling concern.

The Committee commenced a detailed discussion of Sealing Consolidated Formations. John Sharkey pointed out that unperforated casing must be set to the top of the competent formation and drillers had three options:

- Full length seal;
- Seal 5-ft into the competent layer; or
- Seal up 5 ft from the interface.

Roger Buchanan drew a diagram of a well completed within basalt in Eastern Idaho. John Sharkey pointed out that 5 ft up from the interface or into the competent layer is a minimum requirement.

Jody Denning pointed out that his firm could install granules, but it would not meet the new rules. The granules are not thick enough. Under reaming is an issue and could be trouble for drillers. When driving shoe into basalt, shoe is usually adequate. He would look into borehole and there was no leaking. But, the basalts are fractured and fractures extend out from the borehole into the basalt. If there an allowance to drive shoe into basalt, or must driller use one of the three options?

John Sharkey replied that waivers are not off the table. In some cases, drive shoes would be OK. But, IDWR wants to make sure the seal is there as it is critical.

Brett McCarty asked if there is no water above bedrock, would seals be required?

John Sharkey answered, "Yes." The zone at the top of the basalt is critical.

The committee commenced a long discussion of various situations, including artesian (flowing wells and wells that do not flow at the surface) and wells within water table aquifers. The committee discussed liner and casing as applied to thermoplastic pipe.

In response to questions about the definition, Mr. Sharkey stated that IDWR would rethink the terms weathered and fractured. Perhaps add non-weathered and non fractured, and add "stays open". In Rule 40, lines 455-462 new language would be added.

Tony Hackett asked if the well will clean up and stay open, drillers could install thermoplastic pipe and a shale trap to hold the seal.

Rob Whitney stated that below the trap and seal, the thermoplastic pipe would be a liner. IDWR would change the language to require centralizers in the incompetent zones.

The Committee discussed seals of non-flowing artesian wells. IDWR suggested sealing to the head if it is not above the shallow water table.

The Committee commenced discussion of Rule 52, sealing the annular space. Mr. Sharkey stated that the proposed language is based on the public water system rules, practical experience, and manufacturer's recommendations

The Committee discussed and commented on various lines in Rule 52.

- Various comments were made on a line-by-line basis

- Committee members questions if chips above the water table should be hydrated. Some members pointed out the hydration causes bridges, but some observed scientific studies concluding that chips installed dry will never hydrate above the water table.

The Committee began discussing proper placement of grout bentonite and standards forth in the tabular format in the rule. The discussion included a wide range of practices that where discussed as being appropriate or inappropriate for various reasons.

The requirement for material to be approved by National Sanitary Foundation (NSF) was discussed IDWR explained that the rationale for this requirement was to ensure materials placed in a well are designed for use in wells from the standpoint of sanitation and contamination. To protect the resource, it is important not to use contaminated or uncertain materials in well construction. NSF standards do not speak to the quality of bentonite as seal material only that it is sanitary

There was agreement that the goal is accepted and is important but doubt was expressed as to whether meeting NSF specifications was needed as long as materials used were packaged and designated for use in wells. It was also agreed that no contaminated materials should be placed in a well and that any such placement of contaminated material would be in violation of the rules.

The group continued discussing other items in the table but did not reach further conclusions or recommendations

Summary

At the close of the meeting, Mike Hart observed that a substantial amount of progress was made at this meeting. While there had been sensitivities expressed early on, the work session was professional and productive.

Chuck Galloway urged the committee to examine the schedule posted on the website and reiterated the department's commitment to continue gathering input both in and outside the meetings.

Chuck Galloway committed to setting up a weekly open line call in number to facilitate further discussions to continue making progress on rule drafting with the time in the schedule that remains and noted that the process will conclude with public hearings and comment periods even after the committee's work is done. The open line has been set up for Tuesday mornings 7:30 am to 8:30 am.

David Tuthill reiterated IDWR's commitment to continue working with the drilling community and other stakeholders to refine the rules and restated IDWR's commitment to present revised rules to the legislature on schedule. He further committed that the process would remain open and that changes would be communicated to stakeholders throughout the process.

Tony Hackett and Brett McCarty both observed that this meeting was among the most productive in terms of IDWR staff accommodating comments made during the meeting and committing to changes that are on the right track. They indicated that if the discussions were reflected in the next draft, that the process was successful. Both thanked IDWR for this productive interactive meeting. They both expressed concern that the current state of the rules and remaining time may not allow for accommodating regional tailoring or region-specific wording.

Chuck Galloway and Dave Tuthill agreed that it was important to produce good rules and agreed that the concept of region or geology-based standards were a good idea but might be difficult to achieve this round, but it may still be possible to create the framework that would allow regional rules to be implemented later.

Next meeting and schedule

An IDWR open-line call in number will be established and posted on the website to accommodate additional work between now and the next meeting. See the IDWR website for specific details on call in numbers for Tuesday mornings.

The next Committee meeting is scheduled to meet again on Friday, March 2, 2007, using the University of Idaho video conferencing facilities.

The meeting adjourned shortly after 5:30 PM.